

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Examiner: R. Mancho

Art Unit: 3661

10
Reg for
Secos. &
Prt.
Cofes
5-23-00

In re:

Applicant: KUSCHKE

Serial No.: 09/095,397

Filed: June 10, 1998

RECEIVED
MAY 18 2000
TC 3600 MAIL ROOM

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

May 15, 2000

Hon. Commissioner of
Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This communication is responsive to the Office Action of March

13, 2000.

BOX AF

OK to
enter
R.-

9-20-00

-1-

<p>Certificate of Mailing</p> <p>I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231.</p> <p>On <u>5/15/00</u></p> <p><u>[Signature]</u></p>
--

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102 over the patent to Kaneshige.

Also, the disclosure is objected to.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for objections and rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection to the specification, in particular page 1, is not understood. Page 1 specifies the names of the inventors and the title of the invention. It is believed that no changes are needed on this page.

As for the Examiner's rejection of the claims over the art, in particular the patent to Kaneshige, applicants want to make the following remarks.

With the present Amendment applicant submitted additional sketches identified^d as Figures 1, 2, and 3. It should be emphasized that in accordance with the present invention as defined in claims 1 and 7 the screened housing has a housing body, a cover closing the interior of the housing, a substrate mounted on an inner side of the cover and a plurality of webs formed directly on the substrate.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to attached Figure 1 which illustrates the invention disclosed in the patent to Kaneshige. Figure 12 of the patent to Kaneshige and column 4, lines 1-6 describe a casing, the cover of which has an interior 12 and walls 13 that form compartments. The walls and the interior are shielded by plates of for example nickel or copper. It can be seen from Figure 1 illustrating the prior art, that the webs are not formed directly on the substrate, but instead are formed directly on the cover.

In contrast, the screening housing in accordance with the present invention as illustrated in the attached Figure 2 is completely different. The inner side of the cover includes an electromagnetic shield in form of a substrate with the webs being formed directly on the substrate itself. It is stated in the specification, in particular on page 7, lines 7- 8, that the substrate with the webs can be manufactured by casting with mold on the inner sides of the cover. Thus, the individual chambers can be formed without milling. Thereby the problem with the prior art discussed on page 2 of the specification can be overcome. It is believed to be clear that the new features of present invention which are now defined in claims 1 and 2 and illustrated on the attached Figure 2 are not disclosed in the prior art and have nothing to do with the housing disclosed in the patent to Kaneshige as illustrated in the attached Figure 1.

Figure 3 shows the embodiment corresponding to claims 5 and 8 of the present application. It shows that the substrate and the walls formed of one piece with one another. As can be seen from the drawings, this embodiment is even more remote from the device of the patent to Kaneshige. It greatly simplifies the manufacture and mounting of the webs and the substrate, thereby reducing cost of manufacturing the housing. In a formed in this way article, the small cost saving component results in a very substantial total cost saving.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the above presented remarks, claims 1 and 7, the broadest claims on file, should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

As for the dependent claims, these claims depend on the independent claims, they share its presumably allowable features and therefore it is respectfully submitted that they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance,

then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Any costs involved should be charged to the deposit account of the undersigned (No. 19-4675). Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233